



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on _____ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133.

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-29 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-29 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

NEXT AVAILABLE COPY

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 3404

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1,3,5,6,8-13,16,17,22-24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wedel in view of Wywailowski et al. Wedel discloses a dryer arrangement where a suction roll supports a wire and a web in a plurality of drying groups in a single wire draw. Wedel does not however disclose the use of steam treatment on the web. Wywailowski et al teaches a suction roller used in a paper drying section where steam is applied to the web surface (see fig 1). It would have been obvious to have modified the drying arrangement of Wedel to have provided a steam treatment on the suction roller for the purpose of insuring a uniform moisture profile in the web as taught in Wywailowski et al.

Art Unit: 3404

3. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wedel in view of Wywailowski et al as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Skaugen et al. It would have been obvious to have modified the drying arrangement of Wedel in view of Wywailowski et al. to have arranged the dryer groups in normal and inverted patterns for the purpose of permitting easy transfer of the web between adjacent groups as taught in Skaugen et al(see fig 5 and 6).

4. Claims 18-21,28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Walker in view of Wells. Walker discloses a web drying system where moisture is applied to the web to improve the web moisture profile. Walker does not however disclose using steam as the means to moisten the web. Wells teaches a web moisture profile adjustment system where steam is used to insure an even distribution of moisture across the web surface. It would have been obvious to have modified the web treatment system of Walker to have substituted the steam treatment of Wells for the water spray application system of Walker for the purpose of insuring more even distribution of moisture in the web as taught in Wells. The number of steam boxes used is considered a matter of design choice since applicant has not alleged any criticality to the number of steam boxes used nor has any unexpected results been show in the use of multiple steam boxes.

Art Unit: 3404

5. The amendment filed 09-20-93 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 132 because it introduces new matter into the specification. 35 U.S.C. § 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 8 which specify that steam is applied to web while on a wire. A reading of the disclosure reveals that in the twin wire draw which claims 14 and 15 are directed to, steam is applied to the web without any wire support(see fig 3).

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the response to this Office action.

6. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Bennett whose telephone number is (703) 308-2639.

HENRY A. BENNET
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 344

hab
December 8, 1993